

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,629,097 to Keith (hereinafter "Keith").

Claims 2 and 4-6, while objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 3 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application's specification. Accordingly, claims 1-6 are currently pending for consideration.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Keith. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 3 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application's specification. To the extent that these rejections might be deemed to apply to the claims as newly-amended, they are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application, as described in newly-amended independent claims 1 and 3, are directed to a unique idea of performing data processing between a plurality of three-dimensionally displayed (or otherwise represented) data. That is, as described in the newly-amended independent claims, embodiments of the disclosure of the

instant application are directed to an information processing method and system that involve three-dimensionally arranging a plurality of data items constituting data group information and performing a data correlation calculation between a plurality of these three-dimensionally arranged information groups based on an arrangement characteristic thereof. For example, dependent claim 2 is directed to a hologram which is one of disclosed arrangement characteristics.

Applicants respectfully submit that the disclosure of the applied Keith reference is particularly different from the above-described embodiments of the instant application, as described in the newly-amended claims. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that Keith discloses a method of facilitating a user's understanding about the relationships between data groups and/or facilitating the discrimination of the relationships between data groups. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that, in the disclosure of Keith, the relationships between ideas and/or actual data are calculated; and the calculated relationships are three-dimensionally displayed.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Keith does not disclose, nor even suggest, the instant application's novel idea of performing data processing between a plurality of data which are three-dimensionally displayed (or otherwise represented).

Even further, Applicants respectfully submit that Keith does not disclose, nor even suggest, a principle idea of embodiments of the instant application of performing calculation of three-dimensional information without modification.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn because Keith does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims

1 and 3, as amended. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)."

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 2 and 4-6, while objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, Applicants respectfully assert that all of the dependent claims are allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claim 1 or 3, as amended, and the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to claims 2 and 4-6 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

Dated: January 11, 2006

By:



Paul A. Fournier

Reg. No. 41,023

Customer No. 055694
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-1209
Tel.: (202) 842-8800
Fax: (202) 842-8465